

REMARKS

Applicant adds claims 53-67. Claims 14-17 and 53-67 are pending in the present application. Claims 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 4,754,555 to Stillman. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Stillman. Claims 14-17 stand rejected for indefiniteness.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and urges allowance of the present application.

Referring to independent claim 14, an electronic device wafer processing intermediate member adapted to receive an electronic device wafer comprises, in part, an electrical interconnect configured to electrically connect the electrical coupling of the electronic device wafer with the electrical coupling of the chuck. Support for claim 14 is provided at least in the originally filed specification from page 3, line 20 spanning to page 5, line 12 as well as page 7, lines 12-20. Claim 14 recites patentable subject matter over the Stillman reference.

Referring to the Stillman reference and page 2, paragraph 3 of the Office Action, it is stated that Stillman discloses an apparatus for inspecting the co-planarity of *leaded surface mounted electronic components*. In the abstract of Stillman, it is set forth that the apparatus of Stillman includes a socket assembly for receiving an electronic circuit package and for contacting leads of the package. It is clear from the explicit teachings of the reference that the device of Stillman is arranged to receive processed components and packages including already processed singulated die. Stillman fails to disclose or suggest an electronic device wafer processing intermediate member adapted to receive an

*electronic device wafer* comprising, in part, an electrical interconnect configured to electrically connect with *the electrical coupling of the electronic device wafer*. Applicant has electronically searched the Stillman reference and has failed to uncover any wafer teachings in Stillman. Stillman fails to disclose or suggest positively recited limitations of claim 14 and claim 14 is allowable for at least this reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 14 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicant hereby adds new claims 53-67. Support for such new claims is provided at least in the originally filed specification at page 3, line 19 spanning to page 5, line 12, and Fig. 3 and the associated teachings thereof at least at page 12, line 18 spanning to page 15, line 6. New claims 53-67 are patentable over the prior art of record and Applicant respectfully requests such allowance in the next Action.

Applicant submits herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. In addition, Applicant submits copies of previously filed forms PTO-1449 which include prior art which has not been initialed by the Examiner. Applicant requests initialization of the references on such forms and return of the initialed forms to the undersigned.

Referring to the indefiniteness rejections, Applicant submits that claims 14-17 are definite and fully in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, it is stated that it is unclear what an electrical coupling of the workpiece and an electrical coupling of the chuck represent. Thereafter, it is questioned whether they are shown in any of the drawings. A careful read of the originally

filed specification reveals exemplary structures illustrated in the Figures and described in the associated respective portions of the specification which support the elements defined in the claims and cited in the Action. For example, Applicant refers the Examiner to page 13, lines 3-19 of the specification wherein a reference 45 corresponds to an exemplary coupling of a chuck and a reference 24 corresponds to an exemplary electrical coupling of a workpiece, such as a wafer. The exemplary arrangements of the originally filed specification and the drawings clearly support the claimed language defined in claim 14.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, requires that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the patent applicant regards as his or her invention. "Distinctly" has been interpreted to mean simply that the claim must have a clear and definite meaning *when construed in the light of the complete patent document*. *Standard Oil Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.*, 774 F.2d 448, 227 USPQ 293 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Further, the definiteness of the claim language employed must not be analyzed in a vacuum, but always in light of the teachings of the prior art and of the particular application disclosure as it would be interpreted by one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art. *Ex Parte Moelands*, 3 USPQ2d 1474, 1476 (P.T.O. Bd. App. & Int'l 1987). See also, *Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey-Owens Ford Co.*, 225 USPQ 634, 641 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Applicant's claims in this regard are definite in light of, and well supported by, its specification. One skilled in the art would have no problem understanding the claims. Furthermore, the claims are certainly definite when the specification and claims are read as a whole. Claims 14-17 are understood by one of ordinary skill in the art and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection. The Examiner is fully

encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone if any other claimed terminology is considered to be indefinite by the Examiner to facilitate prosecution of the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/10/02

By:   
James D. Shaurette  
Reg. No. 39,833

Application Serial No. .... 09/825,664  
Filing Date ..... April 3, 2001  
Inventor ..... David r. Hembree  
Assignee ..... Micron Technology, Inc.  
Group Art Unit ..... 2858  
Examiner ..... V. Nguyen  
Attorney's Docket No. ..... MI22-1680  
Title: ..... "An Electronic Device Workpiece Processing Member"

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE ACCOMPANYING  
RESPONSE TO FEBRUARY 11, 2002 OFFICE ACTION

In the Claims

The claims have been amended as follows. Underlines indicate insertions and ~~strikeouts~~ indicate deletions.

14. (Amended) An electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer processing intermediate member adapted to receive an electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer having an electrical coupling and couple with a chuck having an electrical coupling, the intermediate member comprising:

an electrical interconnect configured to electrically connect the electrical coupling of the electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer with the electrical coupling of the chuck.

15. (Amended) The electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer processing intermediate member according to claim 14 wherein the intermediate member includes a plurality of electrical interconnects configured to electrically connect a plurality of electrical couplings of an electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer and a chuck.

16. (Amended) The electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer processing intermediate member according to claim 14 wherein the electrical interconnect comprises a pogo pin.

17. (Amended) The electronic device ~~workpiece~~ wafer processing intermediate member according to claim 14 wherein the electrical interconnect comprises a wire.

**END OF DOCUMENT**